



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PLACE OF THE COLLEGE IN THE SOCIAL SYSTEM.

THE best approach to a definition of the college is by closing in upon it from the two sides of the institutions between which it stands—the school and the university. And as in the mariner's compass not only is there a northeast between north and east, but several intervening points, so we shall find between the school and the college a school-college, and between the university and the college a university-college, which for our more accurate purposes we shall have to take into account. Before defining the college, let us define in order the school, the university, the school-college, and the university-college.

The school imposes the symbols of communication, together with the rudiments of science, literature, and art, on the more or less unwilling child. I know the words "impose" and "unwilling" sound hard and harsh, and will evoke a protest from the advocates of the sugar-coated education. But, with all due respect for what kindergarten devices, child-study, and pedagogical predigestion can do to make learning attractive, the school must be essentially a grind on facts and principles the full significance of which the child cannot appreciate, and which consequently must appear hard, dry, and dull. The world is so big and complex, the mind of the child is so small and simple, that the process of the application of the one to the other can scarcely be effective without considerable pain. Consequently, in the school there must be rigid discipline, judicious appeal to extraneous motives, and a firm background of unquestioned authority. I appreciate most highly all that has been done in the ways above referred to in the direction of mollifying this discipline. But in a brief definition of a great institution, the essential, not the accidental elements; the enduring features, not the latest phases of it, must be emphasized.

The university, including in that comprehensive term graduate, professional, and technical training, is the exact opposite of the school. The school brings together the large world and the child's small mind; involving the pain of mental stretching to take in materials of which there is no conscious want. The university presupposes

the enlarged mind, which it applies to some small section of truth, such as law, medicine, architecture, engineering, dentistry, forestry, Latin, history, astronomy, or chemistry. This, too, is a somewhat painful process, but its pains are of the opposite nature, due to confining the enlarged mind, full of varied human interests, down to the minute details of a narrow specialty. Of discipline the university has practically nothing. It requires only intellectual results. Such moral and spiritual influences as it affords are offered as opportunities rather than imposed as requirements. Its atmosphere is absolutely free. Its professors are specialists. Its students are supposed to be men.

Having briefly defined the two institutions on either side, it might seem the proper time to present the definition of the college. But on both sides intermediary types have been evolved, which must be carefully distinguished from the college proper—the school-college and the university-college.

The school-college admits its students poorly prepared, and gives them in the school-college the work they ought to have done in the school. Its professors are schoolmasters, teaching several subjects, mainly by the school method of recitation from the book, or repetition of dictated lectures. Laboratory work is confined chiefly to pre-arranged illustrative material. The conduct of the students is minutely supervised by the faculty. Little or nothing inside or outside of the recitation rooms is left to the initiative of the students. A considerable portion of the so-called colleges of the United States are of this school-college type. They are inexpensive; and it is a curious fact that the less endowment they have, the less it costs to attend them. Their graduates, unless by virtue of native wit, hardly have the breadth and initiative necessary for leadership in commercial, professional, and public life.

By the university-college I do not mean necessarily one connected with a university. A college connected with a university may be a real college; and a university-college may be connected with no university. The distinctive mark of the university-college is the application to immature students of methods of instruction and discipline which are adapted only to the mature. Its instruction is given in large lecture courses, with little or no personal interest in

his students on the part of the lecturer, or required reaction on the part of the hearer. This personal contact is sometimes supplied vicariously in the person of a graduate student, or recently fledged doctor of philosophy, who quizzes fractions of the mass at stated intervals. The information imparted is the best and most advanced. The fame of the lecturers is unsurpassed. But the appropriation of the material presented is largely optional. As the personal element in teaching is largely vicarious, learning in turn tends to become vicarious also. Printed notes, expert coaches, improvised "seminars," reduce to comparatively few hours the necessary labor of those who register themselves as students. Affording splendid and unequalled opportunities for the earnest and studious few, they afford the wealthy idler the elegant leisure that he craves.

For the great majority of the students in a university-college even athletics becomes likewise vicarious, exertions in this direction being confined mainly to the lungs and the pocket-book. In so vast a body the opportunity for social leadership and prominence in college affairs is confined to the exceptional few, impossible for the average many. The average boy of eighteen or twenty soon drifts into the irresponsibility of an unnoticed unit in the preponderating mass. Discipline in the university-college becomes practically limited to the requirement that the student shall exercise sufficient control over his animal and social instincts to maintain intense intellectual activity for two periods of two or three weeks in each college year.

By thus closing in upon the college from both sides, and marking off the institutions which come so close to it that they are often confounded with it, we have made the definition of the real college comparatively easy. We are now ready to describe its characteristic marks.

It requires as a condition of admission that the work of the school shall have been thoroughly done. Either by examination before entering, or by elimination at the first opportunity afterwards, it strictly limits its students to those who have had a thorough school training. It does this because it is impossible to give a college education to an untrained mind. It is even more essential that a student shall have done hard work before coming to college than that he shall do hard work while in college. The previously trained mind can get

a great deal out of college with comparatively little work. The mind that has not been previously well trained can get very little out of college, even by hard work. This may be a stumbling-block to the school man, and foolishness to the university man; but the college man knows that, in spite of these criticisms from below and from above, an amount of leisure can be well afforded in college which would be fatal in either academy or university. In order to be profitable, however, it must be the leisure of a mind previously subjected to prolonged and thorough discipline.

The method of teaching in the college is, on the whole, different from that of either school or university. In the school the abstract facts and principles, as laid down in approved and authoritative books, are transmitted by the teacher to the student. The individual reconstruction of those principles and facts in the mind of teacher and student, though important, is relatively less essential. If by gift of genius you get this element of individuality in either teacher or student, you are profoundly grateful; but the school can, and in the vast majority of cases must, get on without the interpreting individuality of the teacher, and the reconstructive unification of the student. I am speaking, not of ideals, but of facts.

Now, there is room for the schoolmaster in the college; but his sphere is very limited. In formal studies like mathematics, and the elements of such languages as have not been previously acquired, every college ought to have two or three thorough drill-masters on its faculty. There is nothing about a college atmosphere that can make analytical geometry easy, or the irregular French verb fascinating, or German prose sentences intelligible without grammar. Such school work as our requirements for admission permit to be postponed until after admission to college must be done then in the hard, exacting school way.

In the university it is the individuality of the student that counts. Not the facts in the text-book, not the insight and interpretation of the professor, but the initiative and reaction of the individual student, is what the university is after. The college in the more advanced courses must introduce also a moderate degree of this university element. Many of our colleges, by the group system, or by the requirement of major and minor subjects as a condition of taking

the bachelor's degree, insist that something like a fourth or a third of a student's courses shall lead up to and culminate in such comparatively independent work. In this way we give every college student a taste of real scholarly work, and discover the comparatively few who are fitted to prosecute it to advantage in the university.

The college professor, the type to which the majority of the college faculty should belong, is very different from either the schoolmaster or the university specialist. He is a man who grasps his subject as a whole, deals with each aspect of it in its relation to the whole, is able to make the subject as a whole unfold from day to day, and grow in the mind of the student into the same splendid proportions that it has assumed in his own; and who can put it to the test of practical application in matters of current interest. If he is a chemist, he is able to give expert testimony in court; if a geologist, he is able to take part in government surveys or lead in exploration; if an economist, he is able to contribute something to the settlement of labor troubles; if a historian or professor of government, he must be able to bring ancient precedent and remote experience to bear on current complications; if a professor of the classics, he must love the masters of English prose and verse all the better for his familiarity with the ancient models, and show how much more the modern things mean when thrown on the ancient background. College students despise a professor who is so lost in his subject that he cannot get out of it, prove its worth by some concrete application, and make life as a whole the larger and richer by the contribution he makes from his special department. He must be human, intensely interested in individuals, eager to see his favorite authors, his beloved pursuits, kindle into enthusiasm the minds he introduces to them. The college professor must know his subject, he must be a competent investigator in it, a thorough master of it. If as a badge of such mastery and aptitude as an investigator he happen to have the degree of Ph.D., all the better; though this is not essential. He must know men, and the large movements and interests of the world outside. He must present his subject, lit up with the enthusiasm of a great personality—an enthusiasm so contagious that the students cannot help catching it from him, and regarding his subject for the time being as the most compelling interest in life. He must be genial, meeting stu-

dents in informal, friendly ways outside of lecture-rooms, either in general social intercourse, or in little clubs for the prosecution of interests related to his subject. He must have high standards of personal character and conduct, and broad charity for those who fall below them. In short, he must be first of all a man whom young men respect, admire, imitate, and love; and then, in addition, he must know the subject he professes in the broad, practical, contagious way described above.

The course of study in a college covers in a broad way the main departments of language and literature, science and art, history, economics, and philosophy. At least four languages besides English—Latin, Greek, French, and German; mathematics; at least four sciences—physics, chemistry, biology, and geology or astronomy; history, both ancient and modern, both American and European; orthodox economic theory and current economic heresy, together with special study of such subjects as banking, taxation, transportation, trust, and labor problems; the principles and problems of government, both national and municipal; literature studied as literature, and not merely the corpse of it in the shroud of grammar and the coffin of philology; philosophy as the attempted answer to the perpetual problems of ontology, cosmology, conduct, and human aspiration; enough of fine art to make one at home in the great buildings and galleries of the world—these are the essentials of the college curriculum.

Each of the leading subjects should be presented in at least three consecutive courses extending over a year each: one elementary; one or more broad, general, interesting, practical; at least one specific, intensive, involving research, initiative, and a chance for originality. These broad middle courses are the distinctive feature of the college, and they are the hardest to get well taught. For one man who can teach a college course of this nature well, you can find ten who can teach a university specialty, and a hundred who can teach the elementary-school course. But if you dare to leave out these broad, comprehensive college courses, or if you fail to get, men who are broad and human enough to teach them, you miss the distinctively college teaching altogether: you have in place of the college one or another of the four institutions previously described.

These real college professors; these men who can make truth

kindle and glow through the dead cold facts of science; who can reveal the throbbing heart of humanity through either ancient or modern words; who can communicate the shock of clashing wills and the struggle of elemental forces through historic periods and economic schedules; who can make philosophy the revelation of the living God, and ethics the gateway of heaven—these men are hard to find—ininitely harder to find than schoolmasters on the one hand, and specialists on the other. Yet unless you can get together at least half a dozen men of this type, you must not pretend to call your aggregation of professors a college faculty; you cannot give your students the distinctive value of a college course.

The discipline of a college is different from that of either a school or a university. The true college maintains a firm authority, and will close its doors rather than yield any essential point of moral character or intellectual efficiency to student clamor and caprice. Yet this authority is kept well in the background, delegated perhaps to some form of student government, and is used only as a last resort when all the arts of persuasion and all the influences of reason fail. Not more than once or twice in a college generation of four years will it ever be necessary to draw the lines sharply, and fight out some carefully chosen issue on grounds of sheer authority.

On the other hand, the college has much of the liberty of the university, yet in such wise that it cannot be perverted into license to do whatever may seem for the time being right in the eyes of immature and inexperienced youth. Spies and threats and petty artificial penalties are as foreign to a true college as to a university. Yet the college does make the way of the transgressor hard—much harder than the university ever attempts to do.

What, then, is the secret, what is the method, of true college discipline, which avoids both these extremes, yet secures the advantages at which both school and university aim? It is personal friendliness, intelligent sympathy, appealing to what is best in the heart of the college student. By intimate appreciation of all worthy student interests, ambitions, and enthusiasms, the college officer comes to understand, by way of contrast, whatever is base, corrupt, and wanton in the life of the little community; and to know by intuition the men who are caught in the toils of these temptations. Any

competent college officer can give you, if not off-hand, certainly after a half-hour's consultation, an accurate account of the character of any student in his institution—his haunts, his habits, his companions, his ways of spending time and money, and all that these involve. Where it seems to be needed, either some professor or the president has a friendly conference with the student, bringing him face to face with the facts and their natural consequences, but making no threats, imposing no penalties—simply calling the student's attention to principles with which he is already perfectly familiar, and offering him whatever help and encouragement toward amendment friendly interest and sympathy can give. Usually the whole matter is strictly confidential between officer and student; though, when this proves inadequate, the aid of students likely to have influence is secured, and in extreme cases the co-operation of parents and friends at home is evoked. Information that is directly or indirectly acquired through this close sympathy with student life is never made the basis of any formal discipline whatever. A student may persist in evil ways, and be known to persist in them, and be treated by the college in no other way than he would be treated in similar circumstances by his father and mother at home. If he performs his work and avoids scandal, he may go on and graduate precisely as he might continue to live under his father's roof. If his evil courses lead to failure in his work, or if they bring scandal upon the college so that his misdoings are brought publicly to the attention of the college through overt acts, or obviously injurious influence, then he is asked to withdraw.

Such, in brief, is the spirit of college discipline. It fits neither the immature nor the mature, but youth who are passing from immaturity into maturity. It appeals to the highest and best motives, and scorns to deal with any others. It brings to bear the strongest personal influences it can summon, but deigns to use no others. It sometimes fails, but is usually in the long run successful. It presupposes absolute sincerity, perfect frankness, endless patience, infinite kindness on the part of the college officer. It is sure to be misunderstood by the general public. It takes the average student about half his college course to come to an understanding of it. It lays those who employ it open to the charge of all manner of partiality, weakness, inefficiency, from those who look at the outside facts and

do not comprehend the inner spirit. But it is the only discipline that fits the college stage of development; it does its work, on the whole effectively; it turns out, as a rule, loyal alumni, moral citizens, Christian men.

In its religious life the college should be as little as possible denominational. The narrowness of sectarianism and the breadth of the collegiate outlook are utterly incompatible. Denominations may lay the eggs of colleges; indeed, most of our colleges owe their inception to denominational zeal. But as soon as the college develops strength it passes inevitably beyond mere denominational control. Church schools are often conspicuous successes. Church colleges are usually conspicuous failures. A church university is a contradiction in terms.

It is equally necessary that the college should be intensely Christian. The administrative officers should believe in the power of the best motives over the worst men, and the application of great principles to little things. He should know that persons are more than the acts which they do. He should believe what most people practically deny—that a sinner can be saved, and that he is worth saving. Now, it is only on such a profoundly Christian basis that a college can be successfully conducted. A college which is not Christian is no college at all. For the faithful, hopeful, loving treatment of persons as free beings of boundless capacity and infinite worth is at once the essence of Christianity and the distinguishing mark of the true college.

Christianity in the college, as everywhere else in the world, presents the two aspects which Jesus contrasted in the parable of the two sons whom the father asked to work in his vineyard. There is the conscious, professed, organized Christianity, which joins the church and the association, attends and takes part in meetings, and casts about to find or invent ways to make both the world and one's self better than they otherwise would be. Sometimes, unfortunately, the Christian of this type neglects that devotion of himself to such forms of good as are already established—the intellectual tasks, the athletic interests, the social life, of the institution. In that case the result is that, good as it means to be, good as in many respects it is, this type of Christianity fails to be appreciated by the majority of the students; the leadership of all forms of college life passes into other hands; and this avowed, expressed, organized Christianity

lives at a poor dying rate, by faculty assistance and student toleration. People who forget the lesson of the parable that there are two types of Christianity, and confound this type with the whole of Christianity, sometimes take a very discouraged view of the condition of Christianity in our colleges.

What, then, is the other, the relatively unconscious, unprofessing type? Who is the Christian who, as Jesus says, in the judgment day will be surprised to find that he was a Christian at all? He is the man who lives for something bigger and better, loses himself in something wider and higher than himself. He does his work with a sense of responsibility for the honest improvement of his powers and opportunities; or, better still, with devotion to some aspect of scientific truth of human welfare that has got hold of him. He enters heartily into the sports and enthusiasm of his fellows; sacrificing comfort and convenience to the promotion of these common ends. He shares his time and property with his friends, and supports generously their common undertakings. He stands up for what is right, yet always has a helping hand for the fellow who has fallen down. He looks forward to life as a sphere where he is going to serve public interests and promote social welfare, at the same time that he supports himself and his family.

Now, if this is Christianity; if the cultivation of these traits and aims is growth in Christian character, then our colleges are mighty agencies for the spread of Christianity. No man can go through one of them, and catch its spirit, without becoming a better Christian for the remainder of his days.

Of course, it is highly desirable that these two types of Christianity should understand and appreciate each other. Especially fortunate is the college where these two types coincide; where the most prominent members of church and association are at the same time the best fellows, and where the best fellows give their influence and support as officers and workers in distinctively Christian organizations. In some men's colleges, and in most women's colleges, this is happily the case. If, now however, we can have but one of the two types, as often happens, we must agree with Jesus that good work and good fellowship, on a basis unconsciously Christian, is better than a conscious profession which remains self-centered and self-satisfied,

outside the more genial and generous current of the life of the community.

The last feature of the college, but by no means the least significant, is this genial, generous social life. Even if nothing were learned save by absorption through the pores, the intimate association with picked men of trained minds for the most impressionable years of one's life, would almost be worth while. To take one's place in such a community; to bear one's share in its common interests and common endeavor; to take the social consequences of one's attitude and actions in a community which sees clearly and speaks frankly, rewards generously and punishes unmercifully, is the best school of character and conduct ever yet devised.

This is the leading consideration in determining the desirable size of a college. As Plato says of the state, we may say of the college: it should be as large as is consistent with organic unity. If some types of life and character—the rich or the poor, the independent or the conservative, the high scholar or the good fellow, the athlete or the man of artistic temperament—are left out, then it is too small. If, on the other hand, a man can be a mere unit in a mass toward which he feels little or no definite responsibility; if his specific contribution is not needed and his individual opinion does not count; if the games are played, and the papers are edited, and the societies are managed, and things generally are conducted by experts whom he merely knows by sight and reputation, then that college is too large for him; he will probably come out of it as small as he went in.

For the most enjoyable and profitable social life the college community inevitably breaks up into little groups—fraternities, musical associations, athletic teams, and clubs for scientific, literary, historical, and philosophical study. Extension and intensity are inversely proportional, and a man who misses the closer contact and warmer fellowship of these smaller groups misses much that is most valuable in college life. Athletics are carried to excess, as is everything else in which youth takes a leading part. But the incidental excesses of a few individuals are much more than counterbalanced by the increased physical health, moral tone, and freedom from asceticism and effeminacy in the college community as a whole. Cut off as they are from the natural outdoor tasks and sports, from chores and

workshops, from hunting and fishing, from sailing and riding, some artificial outlet for physical vigor is absolutely essential. Some object for community enthusiasm, community loyalty, and community sacrifice is equally a moral and social necessity. The worst evil of athletics is not the effort put forth by the athletes themselves, but the extent to which these interests absorb the time and conversation, the thought and aspiration, of both combatants and noncombatants. Even this evil, great as it is, is small in comparison with the moral evils which would infest a group of vigorous young men from whom such an outlet was withheld.

The fraternities and societies likewise have slight possibilities of evil, but accomplish an overwhelming preponderance of good. It is through them, directly or indirectly, that the most effective personal and social influence can be brought to bear on those who need it. Occasionally a fraternity drops to the level of making mere good-fellowship an exclusive end, to which scholarship, morality, and efficiency are merely incidental. A college is fortunate which at any given time does not have one or two fraternities that are tending in this direction. But the contempt of their rivals, the influence of their graduates, the self-respect of the better members themselves, together with direct or indirect faculty remonstrance, serve to bring a fraternity to its senses in a quarter of the time it would take to straighten out an equal number of isolated individuals. Isolated good and isolated evil are more nearly on an equality. But good influence can be organized and mobilized a hundred times as quickly and effectively as evil influence; and where the moral forces in faculty and students are alert, these fraternities serve as rallying-points for the concentration of the good and the dispersion of the evil.

Departmental clubs, in which one or two members of the faculty meet informally with a few of the more interested students for conference on some phase of their subject, are perhaps the consummation of the college spirit. Modern methods of instruction, however, make contact in the laboratory over experiments and in the library for research so close that many of the regular classes assume more the aspect of a club than a class. The newest and best college libraries provide small rooms for the use of books by professors and students together in each literary and historical department, and regard such

rooms quite as indispensable as the stackroom where books alone are stored.

There is one serious danger, and only one, that besets the college. The ordinary objections—hazing, excessive athletics, dissipation, lawlessness, idleness—are due either to exaggeration of exceptional cases, or to the unwarranted expectation that large aggregations of youth will conduct themselves with the decorum that is becoming where two or three mature saints are gathered together for conference and prayer. I grant that a man who cherishes this expectation will be disappointed; and if he chances to be a college officer, and undertakes to realize this expectation, he will be deservedly miserable. With all its incidental follies and excesses, college judgment is more reasonable, college conduct is more orderly, college character is more earnest and upright, than are the judgment, conduct, and character of youth of the same age in factories, offices, and stores, on farms or on shipboard. As far as these matters go, college is physically, mentally, and morally the safest place in the world for a young man.

The one serious danger is so subtle that the public has never suspected its existence, and even to many a college officer the statement of it will come as a surprise. It is the danger of missing that solitude which is the soil of individuality and the fertilizer of genius. College life is excessively gregarious. Men herd together so closely and constantly that they are in danger of becoming too much alike. The pursuit of four or five subjects at the same time tends to destroy that concentration of attention to one thing on which great achievement rests. The same feverish interest in athletics, the same level of gossip, the same attitude toward politics and religion, tend to pass by contagion from the mass to the individual, and supersede independent reflection. The attractiveness and charm of this intense life of the college group tend to become an end in itself, so that the very power which wholesomely takes the student out of himself into the group invites him to stop in the group instead of going on into those intellectual and social interests which the college is supposed to serve. This devotion to college rather than to learning; to the fellows rather than to humanity, to fraternities and teams rather than to church and state, is a real danger to all students, and a very serious danger to the exceptional individuals who have the spark of originality

hidden within their souls. The same forces that expand small, and even average men, may tend to repress and stunt these souls of larger endowment. To guard against this, to make sure that the man of latent genius is protected against this deadening influence of social compulsion toward mediocrity, is one of the great duties of the wise college professor. He must show the student of unusual gifts that he is appreciated and understood, and encourage him to live in the college atmosphere as one who is at the same time apart from it and above it. The formation of little groups, temporary or permanent, among the more earnest students for mutual recognition and support, groups which do for a student while in college actually what Phi Beta Kappa attempts to do in a merely formal and honorary way afterward, may help these choice minds to stem this tide of gregarious mediocrity. Wherever the faculty is alert to detect its presence, even genius can thrive and flourish in a college atmosphere.

Such is the college. It is an institution where young men and young women study great subjects, under broad teachers, in a liberty which is not license, and a leisure which is not idleness; with unselfish participation in a common life and intense devotion to minor groups within the larger body, and special interests inside the general aim; conscious that they are critically watched by friendly eyes, too kind ever to take unfair advantage of their weaknesses and errors, yet too keen ever to be deceived.

The function of the college follows so obviously from the concept that it requires but a word to draw the inference. It makes its graduates the heirs of all the wisdom and experience of the ages; placing, if not within their actual memories, at least within the reach of their developed powers and trained methods, any great aspect of nature or humanity they may hereafter wish to acquire. It gives each one of them a sense of achievement and mastery in some one subject of his choice, giving him in at least that one department the impulse to read its books and study its problems as long as he shall live. It places its alumnus on a plane of social equality with the best people he will ever meet, and gives him a spirit of helpfulness toward the lowliest with whom he will ever come in contact. It makes him the servant of the state in wise counsel and effective leadership. It gives to the church ministers who can do more than turn the cranks

of ecclesiastical machinery and repeat ritualized tradition—prophets who gain first-hand contact with the purposes of God. It prepares men who will bring to the study and practice of law ability to apply eternal principles and ancient precedents to the latest phases of our complex civilization. It trains its graduates who practice medicine to give every patient the benefit of whatever science is developing of healing efficacy for his particular case. It trains men who are to be engineers, bankers, manufacturers, merchants, to put the solidity and integrity of natural law into the structures that they rear, the institutions they control, the fabrics they produce, and the transactions they direct. It trains men and women who will give to domestic and social life that unselfishness and geniality which come of having the mind lifted above the selfish, the artificial, the petty, into sincere and simple intercourse with the good, the true, and the beautiful.

The function of the college, then, is not mental training, on the one hand, nor specialized knowledge, on the other. Incidentally it may do these things at the beginning and at the end of the course, as a completion of the unfinished work of the school, and a preparation for the future pursuits of the university. The function of the college is liberal education: the opening of the mind to the great departments of human interest; the opening of the heart to the great spiritual motives of unselfishness and social service; the opening of the will to opportunity for wise and righteous self-control. Having a different task from either school or university, it has developed a method and spirit, a life and leisure of its own. Judged by school standards, it appears weak, indulgent, superficial. Judged by university standards, it appears vague, general, indefinite. Judged by its true standard as an agency of liberal education; judged by its function to make men and women who have wide interests, generous aims, and high ideals; it will vindicate itself as the most efficient, the most precise, means yet devised to take well-trained boys and girls from the school and send them either on to the university or out into life with a breadth of intellectual view no subsequent specialization can ever take away; a strength of moral purpose which the forces of materialistic selfishness can never break down; a passion for social service which neither popular superstition nor political corruption can deflect from its chosen path.

I cannot sum up the function of the college better than in words formerly used in reply to the question of a popular journal: "Does a College Education Pay?"

To be at home in all lands and all ages; to count nature a familiar acquaintance, and art an intimate friend; to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men's work and the criticism of one's own; to carry the keys of the world's library in one's pocket, and feel its resources behind one in whatever task he undertakes; to make hosts of friends among the men of one's own age who are to be leaders in all walks of life; to lose one's self in generous enthusiasms and co-operate with others for common ends; to learn manners from students who are gentlemen, and form character under professors who are Christians—these are the returns of a college for the best four years of one's life.

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE.